

## CONCLUSIONS

This study describes the first experience in remote neuromonitoring during open surgical repair of DTAA and TAAA. The telemedicine technique has been shown to be feasible, reliable, and effective, allowing assessment of spinal cord function at a distance by means of an Internet connection, leading to excellent clinical outcomes with respect to ischemic spinal cord complications. This technique can contribute to centralization of expertise and saves individual centers the need to invest in complex technology and manpower.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conception and design: AG, WM, JS, ED, MJ

Analysis and interpretation: AG, WM, JS, ED, JG, MJ

Data collection: JG, JS, ED, MJ, WM

Writing the article: AG, JG, MJ

Critical revision of the article: AG, WM, ED, JG, MJ

Final approval of the article: AG, WM, JS, ED, JG, MJ

Statistical analysis: AG, WM,

Obtained funding: Not applicable

Overall responsibility: MJ

## REFERENCES

- Jacobs MJ, Elenbaas TW, Schurink GW, Mess WH, Mochtar B. Assessment of spinal cord integrity during thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm repair. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2002;74:S1864-6.
- Jacobs MJ, Mess W, Mochtar B, Nijenhuis RJ, Statius van Eps RG, Schurink GW. The value of motor evoked potentials in reducing paraplegia during thoracoabdominal aneurysm repair. *J Vasc Surg* 2006;43:239-46.
- Jacobs MJ, Meylaerts SA, de Haan P, de Mol BA, Kalkman CJ. Strategies to prevent neurologic deficit based on motor-evoked potentials in type I and II thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm repair. *J Vasc Surg* 1999;29:48-57.
- Mommertz G, Langer S, Koeppel TA, Schurink GW, Mess WH, Jacobs MJ. Brain and spinal cord protection during simultaneous aortic arch and thoracoabdominal aneurysm repair. *J Vasc Surg* 2009;49:886-92.
- Jacobs MJ, Mommertz G, Koeppel TA, Langer S, Nijenhuis RJ, Mess WH, et al. Surgical repair of thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysms. *J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino)* 2007;48:49-58.
- Jacobs MJ, de Mol BA, Elenbaas T, Mess WH, Kalkman CJ, Schurink GW, et al. Spinal cord blood supply in patients with thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysms. *J Vasc Surg* 2002;35:30-7.
- Singh SN, Wachter RM. Perspectives on medical outsourcing and telemedicine--rough edges in a flat world? *N Engl J Med* 2008;358:1622-7.
- Wachter RM. The "dis-location" of U.S. medicine--the implications of medical outsourcing. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354:661-5.
- Larson DB, Cypel YS, Forman HP, Sunshine JH. A comprehensive portrait of teleradiology in radiology practices: results from the American College of Radiology's 1999 survey. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2005;185:24-35.
- Ebbert TL, Meghea C, Iturbe S, Forman HP, Bhargavan M, Sunshine JH. The state of teleradiology in 2003 and changes since 1999. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2007;188:W103-12.
- Coselli JS, LeMaire SA, Miller CC, III, Schmittling ZC, Köksoy C, Pagan J, et al. Mortality and paraplegia after thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm repair: a risk factor analysis. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2000;69:409-14.
- LeMaire SA, Miller CC, III, Conklin LD, Schmittling ZC, Coselli JS. Estimating group mortality and paraplegia rates after thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm repair. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2003;75:508-13.
- Brewster LP, Kasirajan K. Thoracic endovascular aneurysm repair for thoracic aneurysms: what we know, what to expect. *Ann Vasc Surg* 2011;25:856-65.
- Cheng D, Martin J, Shennib H, Dunning J, Muneretto C, Schueler S, et al. Endovascular aortic repair versus open surgical repair for descending thoracic aortic disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of comparative studies. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2010;55:986-1001.
- Langer S, Mommertz G, Koeppel TA, Schurink GW, Autschbach R, Jacobs MJ. Surgical correction of failed thoracic endovascular aortic repair. *J Vasc Surg* 2008;47:1195-202.

Submitted Aug 20, 2011; accepted Nov 12, 2011.

## DISCUSSION

**Dr Richard Cambria (Boston, Mass).** Was there a uniform surgical protocol for how to react to changes in motor-evoked potential monitoring across the four centers?

**Dr Michael Jacobs.** Indeed, all surgeons from the different centers came to us and we agreed on the protocol, including cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) drainage and distal aortic perfusion, but also the strategic interventions when evoked potentials would disappear. The first logical step is to increase mean arterial and distal aortic pressure. The second step includes reattachment of intercostal arteries. Extremely important is that the anesthesiologists are well trained and well informed, because the equilibrium between anesthesia and evoked potentials is extremely sensitive. For example, if the patient receives too much muscle relaxant, evoked potentials are unreliable.

**Dr Cambria.** And a follow-up question. Your overall rate of positivity in motor-evoked potential range was in the 50% range. And you quoted no false-positives and no false-negatives. Critics of this technique generally invoke false-positives and false-negatives as the Achilles' heel of it. So will you comment on that?

**Dr Jacobs.** That is true. Others are using the technique as well and might encounter false-positives and false-negatives. However, we believe that this is purely a technical matter, in which attention to neurophysiological principles and to anesthesiological details play major roles. If that is not working in perfect harmony, you might end up with false-positive and false-negative readings.

**Dr Mark Fillinger (Lebanon, NH).** You mentioned delayed paraplegia, and I wondered if you could comment on how you manage your CSF pressure. Do you have volume limits? What volume do you drain to? And do you treat the patients who get intraoperative deficits differently postop than you do the patients who don't get deficits?

**Dr Jacobs.** That is a very important question. It is difficult to assess the reasons for the delayed paraplegia in the other centers. However, I know from our own experience that the patients who developed delayed paraplegia either had very low evoked potentials at the end of the procedure or went through a phase of hypotension, sepsis, or any kind of blood pressure drop causing spinal cord damage. We know from some patients that management of spinal cord drainage appeared to be a very important issue: the drain can be blocked and drainage not functioning, causing unnoticed, delayed paraplegia. We keep the pressure between 0 and 10 cm/H<sub>2</sub>O and drain as much as is needed to keep these pressures.

**Dr Linda Harris (Buffalo, NY).** I have more of an operational question. Since obviously the patients are remote, how was the neurophysiologist compensated for his or her time?

**Dr Jacobs.** Yes, absolutely. There is a contract between the different centers and our neurophysiology department: they are paid per procedure. The obvious advantage at the different centers, being either in Beijing, São Paulo, or Chicago, is that they don't have to organize the neurophysiology set-up on site. The only thing you have to do is buy a machine, which is like \$70,000, and

train a technician to put the electrodes on and make the connection with the central site.

**Dr Peter Glociczki** (*Rochester, Minn*). Could you comment on the role of distal ischemia on the effect of evoked potential measurements? Do you need distal perfusion or a BioMedicus pump in all of these patients to get good results?

**Dr Jacobs**. This is indeed extremely important. We addressed this issue many years ago by stopping distal perfusion for some minutes. In most patients, evoked potential would vanish within minutes. So distal aortic perfusion plays an important role in spinal cord protection by perfusing lumbar and hypogastric arteries during cross-clamping.

**Dr Glociczki**. And could you comment on your current technique of intercostal reimplantation, whether it is a simple reimplantation or a bypass, or what do you think works the best? And do you have a number of patency of intercostal reimplantations?

**Dr Jacobs**. No, we do not have information on intercostal artery patency. However, our strategy is based on the evoked potentials. If we have normal 100% evoked potentials, we oversee the intercostals, except for those in the critical area between T8 and L1, where we reimplant available intercostals, because we know the lower we come in the direction of the iliac vessels during the procedure, the higher the risk will be that you will still lose the evoked potentials. This acts as a sort of a backup system. If we lose the evoked potentials completely, it is very silent in the operating room because we know that if we don't do anything about it, the patient will be paraplegic. We will perform either a bypass or reattachment of segmental vessels. Alternatively, if no intercostals are seen, we rapidly do an endarterectomy of the aortic wall,

showing some back-bleeding intercostals, which will subsequently be treated with a selective graft.

**Dr Roy Greenberg** (*Cleveland, Ohio*). One quick question. We are used to saying that it is the thoracoabdominal aneurysm surgeon that is rare; is the neurophysiologist interpreting the motor-evoked potentials (MEPs) equally rare? How much of the interpretation is art vs science? Is it possible to look forward to computer algorithms that may help us analyze these results, thus minimizing the need for a neurophysiologist to do this? Or is this very much of an art in medicine where the level of complexity and subtlety mixed with patient idiosyncrasies precludes this development?

**Dr Jacobs**. Well, Roy, I will take that question with me back home and ask the neurophysiologist. It is important to realize that the neurophysiologist is not only reading the signals. If evoked potential disappears, they follow a decision tree, assessing what can cause the trouble. Is it an electrode problem? Is it anesthesia? Is it low blood pressure? Is it calcium? Is it magnesium? They go through that algorithm very quickly, which is very important since they have to assure us whether it is a technical issue or indeed a real spinal cord problem.

**Dr Greenberg**. There is a lot of communication going back and forth all the time.

**Dr Jacobs**. Absolutely.

**Dr Cambria**. And I'll offer a comment too. We have become very fond of this technique, and I agree with Michael that the technique is highly dependent on having an expert neurophysiology team to be sure that you have an adequate technical accomplishment of the monitoring.

---

## INVITED COMMENTARY

**Manju Kalra, MBBS, Rochester, Minn**

Dr Jacobs and his colleagues are to be commended for this first of a kind enterprise using cyber medicine to provide remote neuromonitoring of motor evoked potentials during open thoracoabdominal aortic aneurysm repair. The authors have previously reported extensively on the use of motor evoked potentials as an adjunct for spinal cord protection during these procedures. The complexity, learning curve, and cost have limited the use of this mode of monitoring to a few tertiary centers around the world. With this study, the authors have demonstrated not only the feasibility of a central core center providing this mode of real-time neuromonitoring remotely but also its effectiveness by having achieved similar low rates of spinal cord ischemic complications in the peripheral centers as their own.

The fact that all 130 procedures were successfully performed with complete data transfer to the neurophysiologist at the central institution without time delay is incredible. A Virtual Private Network was set up to enable this, but the fact that this worked flawlessly for several hours at a time during these long procedures is almost unbelievable. Although a backup plan for direct communication with the neurophysiologist through telephone was in place in case of technical problems with the transmission, I wonder

if that would have been adequate to pick up subtle changes and troubleshoot satisfactorily.

Whether this technology transfer can be duplicated in other parts of the world remains to be seen. In addition to working out the technical details of remotely providing the service, other aspects would need to be addressed. How would the providing institution be reimbursed for providing the service? Contractual agreements between the participating institutions would have to be fairly complex, given the sensitive nature of the continuous data transfer and the need for immediate action based upon changes, which were not infrequent in this study. Which institution would be liable in case of complications arising from a breakdown of data transfer? These issues would be particularly relevant in the United States with the existing model of health care delivery. They were obviously not significant deterrents to this study, as the authors do not provide any insight into them apart from pointing out the cost savings of not reduplicating the neuromonitoring capability in multiple centers. Regardless, I would like to congratulate the authors for this elegant collaborative study that is very appropriate in the current age of widespread Internet technology.